

REMARKS

I. PENDING CLAIMS AND SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5, 9-26, and 28 will be pending in this application. Applicants have rewritten claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 2, i.e., that the composition contains platinum, which the Examiner has indicated to be allowable. Moreover, Applicants have retained claims 3-5, since these depend from, and further limit, claim 1. These claims must therefore also be allowable. Applicants have canceled claims 6-8, as these are beyond the scope of amended claim 1, and have amended claims 9 and 10 to depend from allowable claim 3, rather than from canceled claim 6. Applicants have retained claims 11-15, as these claims also depend, indirectly, from claim 1, and thus must therefore also be allowable. Applicants have amended claim 16 to correct the dependency thereof, and have retained claims 17-24 for this same reason.

Applicants have amended claim 25 to recite the presence of platinum in the composition. Claim 25 has been retained because, as amended, the composition used in claim 25 corresponds in scope to the composition claimed in allowable claim 1. A method of using a patentable product must also, by definition, be patentable.

Applicants have amended claim 26 to recite the particulars of claim 27, which has been canceled. Claim 28 has been amended to depend on claim 26. This effectively rewrites claim 27 into independent form, which the Examiner has indicated would render the claim allowable.

No new matter has been added.

II. REQUEST FOR REJOINDER

Applicants note that in paragraph 1 of the Office action, the Examiner has made the requirement for restriction final. In light of Applicants' amendments above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the restriction requirement and examine all of the claims on the merits. Because logic dictates that the claims, which are in all cases either narrower in scope than allowable claim 1, or directed to a method of using the composition of claim 1, or narrower than allowable claim 27, they must all be allowable, there is essentially no additional burden on the Examiner to rejoining the nonelected claims.

III. OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION

In paragraph 4 of the Office action, the Examiner has rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Foerster (U.S. Patent No. 3,705,029), Kugler (U.S. Patent No. 4,511,398), Garat (U.S. Patent No. 5,058,653), or Mori (U.S. Patent No. 4,732,820). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

Applicants have amended claim 26 to incorporate the limitations of claim 27, which the Examiner has indicated would place the claim in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for immediate allowance, and an early notification to that effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any issues remain to be resolved, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange for a telephonic interview before issuance of any final rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit
any overpayment to Deposit Order Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce D. Gray
Reg. No. 35, 799

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
Suite 2800, 1100 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
(404) 815-6218